



July 5, 2016

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL # 1670

Public Library - Needs Assessment of Services and Programmatic Facility Design

ADDENDUM #1

The City of Springfield is hereby amending the above mentioned RFP. The original document can be found on the City's website at www.springfield-or.gov. By selecting the hyperlink *Purchasing/Contracts* from the menu on the left side of the home page, interested parties will be linked to the RFP/ITB page.

1. **Question:** Are both Phase I and Phase II of the project funded?

City's Response: Currently only Phase I is funded with Phase II funding contingent upon the findings and recommendations coming from Phase I.

2. **Question:** What is the target date for completion of Phase 1?

City's Response: We would like to have Phase I work and report completed by December 31, 2016.

3. **Question:** Is there an estimated budget for Phase 1?

City's Response: We have a maximum budget of \$50,000 for Phase I.

4. **Question:** Does the City have a specific site(s) in mind in the event a new facility is deemed preferable? This would be necessary in order to develop Library Design Alternatives.

City's Response: The City has identified existing city-owned property in the downtown core adjacent to the existing City Hall / Library facility. Expanding the existing City Hall / Library facility should also be considered.

5. **Question:** It is assumed that the assessment of the existing facility will require input from a structural engineer and cost estimator. Please confirm.

City's Response: Yes, in order to determine the viability of any proposed expansion strategy.

6. **Question: Page 3: III. Proposal Submission Requirements**

"Submissions must include the items organized and numbered to correspond to each requirement below"
(items 1-12)

The required information, as listed, does not correspond chronologically with the Evaluation Criteria listed on pages 5-6. And, in some cases, the Evaluation Criteria lists scored information which is not addressed/requested in items 1-12. Please clarify/advise.

City's Response: Evaluation criteria is what we are looking for in all information provided in Section III, e.g.

- Assessment/program experience...might be determined from #2 Cover Letter, #3 Qualifications, #5 Key Personnel, #6 Subcontractors, #7 References, etc.
- References...will likely be determined from #7 References

- Timeline...should be discernable from #4 Implementation Plan
- Technology Platform/Flexible Public Meeting Space experience...might be determined from #2 cover letter, #3 Qualifications, #5 Key Personnel, #6 Subcontractors, #7 References, etc.
- Design and construction of public libraries in comparable communities...might be determined #2 Cover Letter, #3 Qualifications, #5 Key Personnel, #6 Subcontractors, #7 References
- Completeness will be in the scoring panel's best judgement

7. Question: Page 12: 1/g/ii & 2/b

1/g/ii): *"Design concepts and facility space planning diagrams..."* This phase (Phase 1) is an assessment phase. (2/b): Phase 2 calls for a facility program, including *"Design concepts and facility space planning diagrams..."* also.

This appears to be a repeat of the same verbiage. Wouldn't it be out of sequence in Phase 1?

City's Response: What we are looking for in Phase I are high level conceptual diagrams of how our existing library works currently in comparison with how it can be improved or expanded. We would expect the community input gathered during Phase I to strongly influence conceptual ideas and recommendations and the Phase I work should include idealized library space planning bubble diagrams scaled to community needs (Attachment 1.2.b). Phase II would yield more specific diagrams of actual design concepts that could realize those expressed needs in either our current setting through expansion and improvement or through the construction of a new library facility.

8. Question: Page 12: 1/g/iii

"...recommendation for either existing expansion/modification and/or new facility investment w/tiered preliminary cost estimates..."

This also seems premature in Phase 1, as at this point, there isn't a specific program to satisfy. Please clarify.

City's Response: What we are looking for, based on high level cost estimates tied to rough square footage needs, is a recommendation on which track to pursue; expand our existing facility or build a new facility.

9. Question: Page 12: 2/e & h

(2/e): *"Provide a strategy, with estimated costs (Attachment 2) + timing of implementation...."*

Attachment 2 is not a chart, it's a list of questions. Attachment 3 is a chart, but doesn't include a timeline, so doesn't appear it will work for this purpose. Please clarify specific format/content desired to address this.

(2/h): *"Recommend an implementation schedule which uses a prioritized, phased approach..."*

A prioritized, phased approach seems as though it would relate to the construction schedule, not the assessment schedule. Please clarify what is being requested here.

City's Response: We are looking for a schedule focused on the work to be done through both phases of this needs assessment and facility design consultation. We would like to see that timeline in the form of a Gantt chart or comparable project timeline layout.

10. Question:

First, ORS 279A.120 (1) (b). It states:

(b) "Resident bidder" means a bidder that has paid unemployment taxes or income taxes in this state during the 12 calendar months immediately preceding submission of the bid, has a business address in this state and has stated in the bid whether the bidder is a "resident bidder" under this paragraph.

We have not paid unemployment or income taxes (perhaps many years ago when we did work in Eugene, Oregon City, etc.), do not have a business address in Oregon, could obtain (depending upon cost) a license to do business in Oregon.

Given the above, would we have a fair shot at the project even though we have probably done more of this work than any possible competitor?

City's Response: The expectation is that the winning proposer would be able to legally do business in the State of OR. That would include any and all licensing necessary.

- 11. Question:** If the Library leaves City Hall is there a plan for City Hall to expand into that space? Or, no decision made at this time?

City's Response: No specific decision or plan at this time.

- 12. Question:** Signing the Cover Letter. A wet signature, or electronic? Your preference?

City's Response: Original ink signature.

- 13. Question:** Can you tell me if it is possible to arrange for a library visitation/tour to gain on-site information prior to submitting a proposal?

City's Response: Our schedule for selection doesn't include an onsite meeting.

In the event that it is necessary to further amend, revise or supplement any part this ITB, additional addenda will be posted on the City's website at <http://www.springfield-or.gov> (select the **Purchase Contracts** hyperlink and RFP 1670 Addendum 1 Public Library Needs Assessment and Programmatic Facility Design). As stated in the original solicitation, City will make a reasonable effort to provide the addenda to all Proposers to whom City provided the initial RFP. This addendum shall be considered part of the specification of the RFP. The City is not responsible for any explanation, clarification, interpretation or approval made or given in any manner except by written addenda issued by City.

ALL BIDDERS SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE AND INCLUDE THIS ADDENDA #1 AS PART OF THEIR SUBMITTAL PACKAGE.